

MINUTES of the Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Redlands held Tuesday, July 13, 2004, at 2:00 p.m. are as follows:

PRESENT: George Webber, Chair
James Macdonald, Vice-Chairman
Ruth Cook, Commissioner
Caroline Laymon, Commissioner
Gary Miller, Commissioner

ABSENT: Thomas Osborne, Commissioner
Paul Thompson, Commissioner

ADVISORY STAFF

PRESENT: Leslie E. Murad II, Assistant City Attorney
Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
John Jaquess, Assistant Director
Robert Dalquest, Principal Planner/Project Manager
Asher Hartel, Senior Planner
Manuel Baeza, Associate Planner
Alicia Heideman, Junior Planner
David Jump, Junior Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - 3 MINUTES

Chairman Webber called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All commissioners were present except Commissioners Osborne and Thompson.

Chairman Webber advised the Commission and members of the audience that the Civic Center parking lot is a designated 30 minute and 60 minute parking zone. Chairman Webber stated that parking permits may be obtained from the Planning Commission secretary and should be placed on the vehicle dashboard to prevent receiving a parking citation.

II. CONSENT ITEMS- NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Webber stated addenda item V-D would be heard first, at the request of staff.

D. **REQUEST FOR TEMPORARY OCCUPANCY FOR COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 748 - R. P. WAGES**

Director Jeff Shaw stated that staff received a request for occupancy from Mr. Pat Meyer on behalf of R. P. Wages. Mr. Shaw stated the R. P. Wages project is a significant industrial park consisting of 28 buildings located at the corner of Alabama and Park, that was approved by City Council in April 2003. Mr. Shaw stated they are requesting occupancy for Building 16. Mr. Shaw stated the project contributed a significant amount of traffic to the intersection of Redlands Boulevard and Alabama Street. As a result, a 4/5 overriding vote of approval was required for all future projects adding traffic to the intersection.

Mr. Shaw stated Conditions of Approval for the project required that traffic signals at the intersection of Alabama/Park and Alabama/Citrus be installed and fully functional prior to occupancy. Mr. Shaw stated the applicant is requesting some flexibility with regard to the Conditions of Approval so as to permit temporary occupancy for one of the buildings within the park, Building 16.

Mr. Shaw stated the applicant requested traffic information relative to the traffic impact based on the occupancy of the one building. Mr. Shaw stated an evaluation was included in the Planning Commission packet along with a memorandum. Mr. Shaw stated it was important to staff to determine whether the occupancy of the building would change the Level of Service (LOS) for either of the two intersections. Mr. Shaw stated an evaluation by the traffic consultant determined the building occupancy would not lower the LOS. Mr. Shaw stated the applicant indicates the traffic signal at Alabama/Park will be installed prior to any further requests for occupancy.

Mr. Shaw stated there is another issue relative to the traffic signal at Citrus/Alabama, however the request before the Commission only relates to the temporary occupancy of Building 16.

Commissioner Macdonald asked for clarification on the notation "the applicant indicates they will formally approach the City Council for an equitable solution to the other traffic signal." Mr. Shaw responded by saying the traffic signal at Alabama/Citrus is a City fee signal, and it is the applicant's opinion that the City should install the traffic signal, as opposed to the applicant installing the signal. However, Mr. Shaw stated the project Conditions of Approval require both signals be installed prior to occupancy.

Commissioner Macdonald asked why the applicant agreed to the Conditions of Approval, only to come back at a later time and object to the requirement.

Mr. Pat Meyer, representing the applicant, stated the traffic signal at Alabama/Park is currently under construction. Mr. Meyer stated the City has been collecting fees for the Alabama/Citrus traffic signal for the past twenty years and it is their opinion that the City cannot collect fees, and later ask that it be paid for by someone else.

Mr. Meyer stated he met with the City Engineer after the project was approved and was told to prepare the working drawings for the traffic signal as their fee contribution. Mr. Meyer stated that he will go before the City Council with a request to install the signal with the fees collected, or have the City reimburse the developer for the cost of the signal.

Commissioner Miller stated he does not associate the request for temporary occupancy with the traffic signal issue.

Chairman Webber stated he would support the request.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote to allow the temporary occupancy of Building 16 as requested by the applicant.

Commissioner Laymon recuse herself at 2:15 p.m. due to a possible conflict of interest.

A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2004-2-A - Planning Commission to consider

a recommendation to the City Council on a Negative Declaration and a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a General Plan Amendment to amend the Trails Map (GP Figure 7.1) by: (a) adding nineteen (19) multi-use off-road trails throughout the San Timoteo Canyon and Live Oak Canyon areas; (b) adding a multi-use on- and off-road trail located south of the Redlands Municipal Airport between Judson Street and Wabash Avenue; and (c) adding a multi-use on-road trail along San Timoteo Canyon Road from the San Timoteo Creek crossing to Alessandro Road. Request submitted by CITY OF REDLANDS.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest stated the Commission reviewed and recommended approval of the project to the City Council on June 8th, however minor changes have been made to the trails map. Mr. Shaw stated staff received a number of letters and emails expressing concern on the proposed amendment. Mr. Shaw stated, given the number of concerns expressed, staff would like additional time to work with the residents who expressed their concerns, and possibly propose alternative language for the trails map. Mr. Shaw stated staff recommends the project be continued to allow staff sufficient time to evaluate and consider changes to the trails map prior to the Commission making a recommendation to the City Council.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-0 vote (Commissioner Laymon excused) that the Planning Commission continue General Plan Amendment No. 2004-2-A to September 14, 2004.

Commissioner Laymon returned to the meeting at 2:22 p.m.

- B. **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 716 (REVISION NO. 1) - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission to consider a revision to an approved conditional use permit for a three-story hotel on 3.31 acres by modifying the site plan and landscape plan in order to subdivide the site into two parcels located on the south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway, west of Tennessee Street in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by GAYATREE PATEL.
- C. **MINOR SUBDIVISION NO. 272 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a tentative parcel map to subdivide 3.31 acres into two (2) commercial parcels located on the south side of the Interstate 10 Freeway, west of Tennessee Street in the General Commercial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by GAYATREE PATEL.

Project Planner Bob Dalquest stated the project which is currently under construction, was approved at a time when the floor area ratio in the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan was 25%. Mr. Dalquest stated a year later, the floor area ratio for hotels was amended to 60%, allowing the applicant to subdivide excess land on their property. Mr. Dalquest stated there is an issue relative to running a water/sewer easement through the property therefore, staff recommends the proposed project be continued to August 10, 2004.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman

Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Conditional Use Permit No. 716 (Revision 1) and Minor Subdivision No. 272 to August 10, 2004.

- D. **ZONE CHANGE NO. 404 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a Zone Change from A-1, Agricultural District to proposed zoning of R-E, Residential Estate District for property with an area of approximately 5.5 acres located on the northeast corner of Fifth Avenue and Dearborn Street. Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
- E. **VARIANCE NO. 679 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a Variance from Section 18.36.050 A. of the Municipal Code to allow a fifteen (15) foot reduction in the required lot width from a one hundred (100) foot width to an eighty-five (85) foot width for two proposed single family residential lots both to be located on the east side of Dearborn Street approximately 170 feet north of Fifth Avenue. Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
- F. **VARIANCE NO. 680 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study and a Variance from Section 18.36.050 B. of the Municipal Code to allow an eight (8) foot six (6) inch reduction in the required lot depth from one hundred twenty (120) feet to one hundred eleven (111) feet six (6) inches for a proposed single family residential lot to be located on the north side Fifth Avenue approximately one hundred and seventy five (175) feet east of Dearborn Street. Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
- G. **TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 16907 -Public Hearing** for the Planning Commission to consider a recommendation to the City Council on a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 5.5 acres into ten (10) residential lots for property located on the northeast corner of Fifth Avenue and Dearborn Street. In the A-1, Agricultural District (proposed R-E, Residential Estate District). Request submitted by PANDA HOMES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Director Jeff Shaw recused himself due to the fact that his residence is within 500 feet of the proposed project.

Project Planner Manuel Baeza stated he was contacted by the applicant earlier that day and asked to continue the project to the following meeting. Mr. Baeza gave a brief presentation on the proposed project and requested comments and/or concerns from the Commission.

Mr. Baeza stated the zone change is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of low density residential.

Mr. Baeza stated the applicant is requesting two variances. The first request is to allow two (2) lots with a width of eighty-five (85) feet, which is less than the one hundred (100) foot required width. Mr. Baeza stated staff is recommending denial of the request due to the fact that staff was unable locate another lot within the R-E designation with a width of eighty five feet.

Mr. Baeza stated the second variance is to allow a lot depth of one hundred eleven (111) feet, which is less than the required one hundred twenty (120) foot depth. Due to the fact that a City requirement for a block wall will result in a loss of property frontage below the one hundred twenty (120) foot minimum and staff found another parcel with a lot depth less than one hundred twenty (120) feet, staff recommends approval of that variance request.

Mr. Baeza stated the project could be continued to allow the applicant an opportunity to redesign the project to include nine (9) residential lots.

Commissioners Macdonald and Laymon requested additional information on the nearby parcel that did not meet the minimum lot depth requirement.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Glenn Arnell, representing the applicant, stated they would not have submitted an application for two (2) lots if they had known the City Attorney would recommend denial of the application. Mr. Arnell stated they did not realize the surrounding properties were zoned differently.

Assistant City Attorney Les Murad suggested the project be designed in such a way that a variance is not necessary.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission continue Zone Change No. 404, Variance No. 679, Variance No. 680, and Tentative Tract No. 16907 to July 27, 2004.

- H. **VARIANCE NO. 685 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider a Variance from Section 18.40.120 of the Municipal Code to allow a reduction of the required front yard setback from 25 feet to 7 feet 9 inches in the Suburban Residential District (R-S), specifically located at 827 West Fern Avenue. This request is being submitted by FLANIGAN CONSTRUCTION, INC.

Project Planner David Jump gave a brief presentation on the proposed project and stated staff is recommending approval of the variance.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing. Seeing no comments forthcoming, Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Variance No. 685 subject to the following findings:

1. There are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the

property or the intended use that do not apply generally to other properties or uses in the same vicinity and zone because this property is a corner lot and other improvements on-site such as the pool limit expansion options.

2. The variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zoning district, but which is denied to the property in question as identified in the staff report.
3. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements of others in the vicinity as there is sufficient distance to ensure aesthetic and safety issues are minimized.
4. The granting of the variance will not adversely affect the General Plan of the City of Redlands.

Mr. Shaw returned to the meeting at 2:40 p.m.

- I. **VARIANCE NO. 683 - PUBLIC HEARING** for Planning Commission consideration of a Variance from Section 18.40.110 of the Redlands Municipal Code to extend the height requirement for a building for a residential home from thirty-five (35) feet to forty-two (42) feet for a property located on the north side of Blossom Avenue, east of Bellevue Ave on Lot 1 of Tract No. 16480 in the R-S, Residential Suburban Zone. Request submitted by JERRY AND KAREN LUBBEN.
- J. **BUILDING MOVING PERMIT NO. 115 - PUBLIC HEARING** for the Planning Commission to consider the relocation of a home to a property located on the north side of Blossom Avenue, east of Bellevue Ave on Lot 1 of Tract No. 16480 in the R-S, Residential Suburban Zone. Request submitted by JERRY AND KAREN LUBBEN.

Assistant Director Jaquess stated staff received a letter from the applicant requesting the proposed project be withdrawn due to health reasons. No action was taken.

- K. **COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 759 (REVISION NO. 1) - Planning Commission** to consider a Mitigated Negative Declaration, a **PUBLIC HEARING** for a Socio-Economic Cost/Benefit Study, and a **PUBLIC HEARING** on a Revision to a previously approved Commission Review and Approval for the "Barton House" on a 3.57 acre site to convert existing outbuildings/stables to single story offices of 3,600 square feet, and to construct or relocate five (5) buildings with an area of 4,154 square feet for office/retail commercial use. The total floor area of existing and proposed buildings is 13,434 square feet, located at 11245 Nevada Street in the Administrative Professional District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan. Request submitted by GENEIL AND TERRY VINES.

Project Planner Asher Hartel gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Mr. Hartel stated the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission (HSPC) reviewed the project and approved the building elevations with one exception; the Commission felt the doors and windows should be comprised of wood rather than aluminum as proposed. Mr. Hartel stated staff concurred with the

comments.

Mr. Hartel stated the applicant submitted conceptual photos of the project with the intent to have the project site plan approved. Mr. Hartel stated the HSPC did not agree with the conceptual photos as they considered them to be Craftsman style, rather than ranch style, which is their preference. Mr. Hartel stated that Planning Division Condition of Approval 28 requires the site plan for buildings 3 through 7 be approved by both the Commission and the HSPC. Mr. Hartel stated staff recommends approval of the stable building elevations and exterior finishes with the addition of a Condition of Approval that requires wooden doors and windows.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Commissioner Miller stated he appreciates the dedication exhibited by Mr. Vines to preserve Redlands' history. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Vines to consider window mullions similar to the window styles used in bungalow homes.

Dr. Vines concurred with Commissioner Miller's suggestion.

Dr. Terry Vines, applicant, stated he might go with wood siding on the lower section of the window. Dr. Vines stated he wanted to change the doors to make them look more like the doors of that era.

Commissioner Miller suggested a Condition of Approval be added that requires additional window mutins and a raised seal at the glass.

Commissioner Cook asked Dr. Vines about the statement in the staff report that stated he was going to relocate the building. Dr. Vines stated originally he was going to go with a bungalow design but HSPC felt that style did not blend in with the site. Dr. Vines stated he decided to go with a ranch style design.

Commissioner Cook commented that Dr. Vines was doing a great job.

Chairman Webber closed the public hearing.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Commission Review and Approval No. 759, Revision No. 1, and direct staff to file and post a "Notice of Determination" in accordance with City guidelines. It has been determined this project will not individually or cumulatively affect wildlife resources as defined in Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Socio-Economic Cost Benefit Study for Commission Review and Approval No. 759, Revision No. 1, as it has been determined that this project will not create unmitigable physical blight or overburden public services in the community, and no additional information or evaluation is needed.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Macdonald, seconded by Commissioner Miller, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve Commission Review and Approval No. 759, Revision No. 1, subject to the following findings:

1. The size and shape of the site are adequate for the proposed office, limited retail and wedding facility uses.
2. The site properly relates to Barton Road and Nevada Street, which are designed and improved to carry the type and quantity of traffic to be generated by office and limited retail uses and the conducting of weddings.
3. The conditions proposed for Commission Review and Approval No. 759, Revision No. 1, and shown on the site plan are necessary to protect the public health, safety and general welfare of the neighborhood and the City of Redlands.
4. When completed, the project will contribute to the overall development of the neighborhood
5. The proposed project will be consistent with the existing Office Designation of the General Plan with the addition of Planning Division Condition of Approval 30 to read:

Provide additional window mutins on the stable building and raise the seal off the floor a minimum of 18 inches.

V. ADDENDA

F. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR COMMISSION REVIEW AND APPROVAL NO. 749 - BERKSON REALTY

Commissioner Miller recused himself at 3:02 p.m. due to a possible conflict of interest.

Project Planner Alicia Heideman gave a brief presentation on the proposed project. Ms. Heideman stated noted some issues that were unclear in the original staff report:

- There was no landscaping around Building 2 shown on the original site plan. Ms. Heideman stated the applicant will submit a separate final landscape plan for Building 2.
- The applicant did not provide trees up against the south and west parking spaces of Building 1. Ms. Heideman stated a Condition of Approval was added requiring the trees, and the plans were revised to show the trees have been added around Buildings 1 and 2, although it was not a requirement for Building 2. A copy of the plan was distributed to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Mr. Shaw suggested the Conditions of Approval be revised to indicate the approval is for Phase I of the Landscape Plan, with a requirement that Phase II return to the Commission for approval.

Chairman Webber asked Ms. Heideman if language will be added to note that the approval is for Phase I of the landscaping plan. Ms. Heideman stated the wording for Condition of Approval 9 will be revised to read:

This approval is for Phase 1 of the Final Landscape Plans for Commission Review and Approval No. 749. Phase II of the Landscape plans which will include the landscaping for future building number two shall be approved by the Planning Commission as an Addendum Item prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for building 2 and shall include the following:

Chairman Webber asked if the applicant's representative was available to answer questions.

Ms. Jody Parker, GMID, stated Phase II will be in construction in approximately one (1) year. Ms. Parker stated they would like to install the trees wells on the south and west sides of future Building 2 in Phase I.

Ms. Laymon stated the project will be conditioned to provide that the trees will be allowed to reach full canopy, and she is not sure if the size of the tree as proposed will allow that to happen.

Chairman Webber stated the trees proposed for the triangular tree wells will have to be changed from ash trees to sweet shade or Brisbane box trees. It was decided the trees will be changed to Brisbane box trees.

Ms. Heideman stated Condition of Approval 8 will revised to read:

The applicant shall add a tree well for every third parking lot space located on the west and south side of Building 1. All trees added must be Brisbane Box.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Laymon, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 4-0 vote (Commissioner Miller excused) that the Planning Commission approve the landscape plans for Commission Review and Approval No. 749 subject to the revisions read to by Ms. Heideman.

Commissioner Miller returned to the meeting at 3:18 p.m.

FINAL MAP FOR PARCEL MAP NO. 16375 - ENGINEERING RESOURCES

Ms. Heideman stated staff is recommending approval of the recordation of Parcel Map No. 16375.

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Laymon, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission grant final approval for Parcel Map No. 16375 (Minor Subdivision No. 268) as submitted by the applicant.

LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 683 - MOUNTAIN VIEW ACRES

Project Planner Alicia Heideman stated the Planning Commission approved Conditional Use Permit No. 683 in January 1999. At that time, the landscape plan included the relocation of 39 existing palm trees. The trees were moved to a temporary site, but for unknown reasons, 26 of the palm trees died.

Ms. Heideman stated the applicant is requesting the plans be revised to reflect the changes made to replace the 26 palms trees.

Although the applicant is replacing the correct number of palms, staff is concerned with the size of the replacement trees (8, 12, and 15 foot tall) and feels that it changes the character of what was originally approved. Ms. Heideman stated staff is recommending a condition of approval that requires all replacement trees must be a minimum of 20 feet in height, since the original trees which were in excess of 50 foot tall.

Ms. Heideman stated the applicant is requesting replacing the twenty-four (24) inch box orange trees with one (1) inch trunk root stock. Ms. Heideman stated staff concurs with the request because past projects have shown that smaller orange trees do better.

Chairman Webber opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jaquess stated the applicant concurs with the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Cook asked Mr. Jaquess why so many of the trees died. Mr. Jaquess responded that he did not know.

Chairman Webber suggested Condition of Approval 7, which requires trees with a 20 foot height, be revised to require a forty (40) foot height. Commissioner Cook and Macdonald concurred with Chairman Webber.

Mr. Bill Feenstra, Construction Coordinator for Mountain View Acres Christian Homes, stated the trees were moved at a cost \$50k. Mr. Feenstra stated the trees were reaching the end of their life but he cannot explain why they died. Chairman Webber asked Mr. Feenstra if it was possible to replace the trees with forty (40) foot tall trees. Mr. Feenstra stated it was possible but it would be very expensive for the non-profit organization. Mr. Feenstra stated he did not think the staggered tree heights are a bad thing.

Commissioner Laymon asked Mr. Feenstra for the height of the trees that were lost. Mr. Feenstra responded, "50 feet." Commissioner Laymon stated it would take many years for the twenty (20) foot tall trees to reach a height of fifty (50) feet. Mr. Shaw stated the trees grow approximately 1- 2 feet per year.

Commissioner Laymon stated she was willing to compromise on the height of the trees, so as not to place a hardship on the applicant. Chairman Webber suggested the trees have a height of forty (40) feet. Commissioner Laymon stated she would agreed to thirty (30) feet. Commissioner Macdonald concurred with Commissioner Laymon.

Commissioner Miller suggested the taller trees be placed at the entrances to the project.

Mr. Feenstra stated the primary entrance is located on Highland Avenue and the secondary entrance for the project is located on Wabash Avenue. Mr. Feenstra stated the tall palms (approximately 10 trees) along Highland Avenue have been preserved.

Ms. Heideman noted that fifty-three (53) of the orange trees were supposed to be 24 inch box. Ms. Heideman stated that staff is agreeable to replacing these trees with stock, resulting in a significant cost savings to the applicant. Ms. Heideman stated the savings could be applied to the cost of the replacement palm trees.

Commissioner Laymon reiterated her recommendation that the palm trees be thirty (30) foot tall.

Mr. Feenstra stated there will be a gated entrance with a guard house at the entrances on Wabash and Highland Avenues.

Commissioner Miller suggested adding a Condition of Approval indicating the main entrance is off Highland Avenue.

Ms. Heideman stated there are eight (8) palms at the Wabash entrance, and the remaining five (5) palm trees will be planted against the main building.

Chairman Webber asked Mr. Feenstra why the eight (8) palms were not placed at the main entrance on Highland Avenue. Mr. Feenstra stated he would welcome placing half the palms at the Highland Avenue entrance.

Commissioner Miller stated the canary island palm is a much more impressive palm for the main entrance at Highland Avenue. Commissioner Miller suggested placing eight (8) canary island palms in place of Mexican fan palms. Commissioner Miller stated the remaining five (5) palms could be placed elsewhere. Commissioner Miller stated the first priority should be the entrance on Highland Avenue.

Commissioner Macdonald suggested placing the eight (8) trees on Wabash, as it is more heavily traveled than Highland Avenue.

Mr. Jaquess stated he is unsure if the Highland Avenue entrance will be constructed within one year, as stated by Mr. Feenstra. Mr. Jaquess stated he does not want the trees placed in an area where they may not be maintained.

Commissioner Miller asked when the Phase II would be developed. Mr. Feenstra stated they plan to complete the street paving within a year and the buildings within five (5) years.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Feenstra if they would be using Wabash as the main entrance in the interim. Mr. Feestra stated they would.

Chairman Webber stated there is a consensus from the Commissioners to allow trees with a thirty (30) foot height. Commissioner Miller suggested the trees at the Highland entrance be changed from Mexican fan palms to canary island palms. Chairman Webber concurred.

Mr. Feenstra stated if thirty (30) foot canary island palms are required at Highland Avenue, it is doable, although he was unsure of the cost. He asked the Commission to consider reducing the height of the trees at the entrance and requested they take final action at today's meeting.

Commissioners Laymon and Miller stated they wanted to stay with the thirty (30) foot height.

Commissioner Miller asked for clarification on the height and proposed location of the new trees. Commissioner Miller requested the Commission review the landscape plan, page by page, to determine the placement of the trees:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Page L6 | Eight (8) thirty foot tall Mexican fan palms changed to canary island palms (4) on each side of the driveway
Three (3) robustas changed from eight (8) foot tall to twelve (12) foot tall |
| Page L7 | Queen palms remain at fifteen (15) foot height
Five (5) robustas changed from eight (8) foot to twelve (12) foot tall |
| Page L8 | Mexican Fan palms around the guard shack changed from eight (8) foot to a minimum fifteen (15) foot tall |

Two queen palms located on either side of the entrance will be thirty (30) foot tall

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Cook, and carried on a 5-0 vote that the Planning Commission approve the Landscape Plan for Conditional Use Permit No. 683 subject to the attached Conditions of Approval as revised.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. June 22, 2004

MOTION

It was moved by Commissioner Cook, seconded by Commissioner Macdonald, and carried on a 4-0 vote (Commissioner Laymon abstaining) that the Planning Commission approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 22, 2004.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE/COMMUNICATIONS

- A. City Council Report

Mr. Shaw reviewed the Planning Commission actions of July 6th.

- B. Status of Major Projects

Mr. Shaw reviewed the Status of Major Projects list.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT to JULY 27, 2004

Chairman Webber adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Ortiz, Senior Administrative Assistant
Community Development Department

Jeffrey L. Shaw, Director
Community Development Department